A Civil Contempt Blog

This blog will describe the unknown and unpublicized true story and bizarre circumstances surrounding the longest, still ongoing, civil contempt sanction in U.S. Federal Court history — now lasting over 11 years, including an imprisonment of over 6 years.

FRIDAY, APRIL 8, 2011

A Tale Of Two Pedophiles — A New Explanation For Jeffrey Epstein's Sweetheart Treatment

A comparison of Jeffrey Epstein's case, and another case, U.S. v. Kent Frank 599 F.3d 1221 (11th Cir. 2010), shows that Roy Black's statement, that Epstein was only facing a 'low-ball' number of 10 years in federal prison, was not accurate. Had the Government pursued Epstein, with the same zeal it pursued Frank, Epstein was facing at least the same 40 years Frank received. In addition, if consecutive sentences were applied, that number increased dramatically. In the Frank case, to reach the 40 years, the 11th Circuit applied a definition to "purchase," under 18 U.S.C. §2251, that included the solicitation of underage girls — the same claims made against Epstein.

I met Mr. Frank at the FDC Miami. And along with 100's of other cases I was requested to look at, I briefly looked at his case. The case against Frank was far weaker than that reported in the press against Jeffrey Epstein.

The Frank case involved an American who traveled to Cambodia as a "sex tourist." Frank was arrested and charged in Cambodia. The age of consent in Cambodia has been reported as being either 15 or 16. Frank was found innocent in Cambodia and released. He was later arrested in Vietnam and extradited to the U.S. on the Cambodian charges. Rights groups have disputed the willingness of Cambodian courts to convict in such cases.

In the U.S. Frank trial, none of the four victims appeared as witnesses. The evidence against Frank was a statement given by Frank in Cambodia in which he admitted he met the girls at bars, paid the girls for sex and to photograph them, and had seen them on multiple occasions. A large number of pornographic photos of the girls, sexual paraphernalia, and DVDs found in his possession were also used as evidence.

Unlike Jeffrey Epstein's case, the ages of the four girls were in dispute. Because Cambodia does not maintain birth records, and without witnesses, the victims ages were determined at trial through the use of expert witnesses viewing the photos taken by Frank. While the 11th Circuit does not specifically mention the theory the experts used to determine age, from what I remember from my brief exposure to the case was that the 'Tanner scale' was used, a measure used in such cases. As Wikipedia describes: "The Tanner scale (also known as the Tanner stages) is a scale of physical development in children, adolescents and adults. The scale defines physical measurements of development based on external primary and secondary sex characteristics."

One criticism of the Tanner scale is that the scale is unreliable for residents of third world countries because poor nutrition delays development. The Tanner scale is not 100% reliable and has been successfully disputed. Wikipedia links to one dramatic case where the alleged victim appeared, as reported in Radaronline: Adult Film Star Verifies Her Age, Saves Fan From 20 Years In Prison! ("Lupe walked into the courtroom and it was like a courtroom drama movie," Assistant Public Defender Hector L. Ramos-Vega said.) The prosecution, in the Carlos Simon-Timmerman case above, proceeded based solely on possession of a purchased pornographic DVD. Obviously, while the Frank case was much stronger than that against Carlos Simon-Timmerman, it was far weaker than the reported case against Epstein, which was proceeding at

SEARCH THIS BLOG

powered by Google™

ABOUT ME

Stephan J. Lawrence

I am an M.I.T. graduate and was originally a financial analyst for several major brokerages and private investment firms. I established a very successful trading company that collapsed in the October 1987 crash after Bear Stearns successfully embezzled 10's of millions of dollars from my companies using backdated fictitious trades that the Chicago Board Options Exchange and the Options Clearing Corp. eventually admitted never occurred.

View my complete profile

BLOG ARCHIVE

- ▼ 2011 (4)
 - **▼** April (2)
 - A Tale Of Two Pedophiles A New Explanation For J...
 - Pedophile Jeffrey Epstein's Accused Intimidator
 - ► March (2)

about the same time. In Epstein's case there where 30-40 potential victims identified whose ages could be confirmed. Indeed, the Carlos Simon-Timmerman case alone — based on a single DVD — makes it clear Jeffrey Epstein received special treatment.

My interest in the Jeffrey Epstein case arose because I don't believe in the type of coincidences I saw:

As I previously posted, the accused chief intimidator of the underage Epstein victims, as identified by the Palm Beach Police Department, was a P.I. named William Riley. It turned out that Riley was also an officer of the local bankruptcy court, who was illegally appointed at a secret off-the-docket hearing that was concealed for many years. In addition, he and a host of other, still not fully identified characters, were afforded a strange and illegal status as a type of federal law enforcement official that permitted them access to protected law enforcement materials. Those materials, which included protected law enforcement tapes (protected under the "Wiretap Act" (Title 3)) were then illegally passed on to Bear Stearns senior managing directors.

A common denominator with Epstein, is the Bear Stearns Companies, Inc. The Bear Stearns Cayman Island Hedge Fund managers were being brought to trial at the time of the sweetheart deal with Jeffrey Epstein. There was no dispute about the critical information in Epstein's possession concerning the Bear Stearns hedge fund trial, particularly since key records were hidden in the Cayman Islands. Epstein's lawyers touted his importance to the Government's case against Bear Stearns as the reason for his special treatment. That treatment included almost daily — and hotly criticized — "furloughs" to his attorneys offices to "help" in the Bear Stearns prosecution. Bear Stearns had enormous incentive to shield Epstein from the threat of a long sentence.

Compare Epstein's case to that of Raj Rajaratnam, the now proceeding Wall Street insider trading case. In the Rajaratnam case, the government obtained pleas from numerous insider witnesses, who were facing long prison sentences, and thereby turned them into damning witnesses against Rajaratnam, as reported in the NY Times. In the Bear Stearns hedge fund trial, the main evidence was email — no insider witnesses were used. Yet, without sweetheart treatment, many witnesses could have been obtained — starting with Jeffrey Epstein and finishing with the senior managing directors of Bear Stearns who had orchestrated the theft of protected law enforcement tapes and other materials.

Bear Stearns was far more effective than Epstein in demonstrating its ability to receive sweetheart treatment — treatment that would also extend to Jeffrey Epstein. Incredibly, Bear Stearns had succeeded in placing Juval Aviv, a discredited self proclaimed Israeli assassin who had been prosecuted by the Government, in control of the local United States Attorney's Office to direct illegal communications surveillance (see earlier posts). Thereby, a flood of protected law enforcement material began secretly flowing to Bear Stearns senior managing directors. The fact that the identity of Bear Stearns, as the ultimate recipient of the materials was carefully concealed, did not excuse what occurred. In late 2004, after I obtained access to the sealed record, I informed the USAO of what I had learned. In 2006, I secured a confession to the crimes.

A key player is Florida local bankruptcy power broker Paul Singerman — himself "Teflon coated" in brushing off his involvement in and ownership of Gibraltar Private Bank & Trust, a Florida private bank found to be violating money laundering laws. Gibraltar was a key player in convicted Ponzi schemer Scott Rothstein's money laundering scheme.

In 2006, I laid out the clear evidence showing how the protected law enforcement materials were being stolen and passed to Bear Stearns. In response, Paul Singerman confessed to passing the law enforcement tapes and other materials to Bear Stearns. Indeed, in April 2006, he brazenly flaunted his activities by stating in a court filing: "according to Lawrence, one of the purposes of Title III is to prevent unlawful communications intercepts being used for "private financial gain." ... sharing the contents of the discovery obtained by court order with Lawrence's largest creditor— Bear Stearns & Co. — ... was entirely appropriate so that they could determine what, if anything, in

